1	Appearances	
2	For the Government:	UNITED STATES ATTORNEY
3 4		William P. Cole Caroline P. Han
4 5		ASSISTANT U.S. ATTORNEYS 880 Front Street, Suite 6293 San Diego, CA 92101
6	For the Defendants:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
7	(Mr. Moalin)	Joshua L. Dratel, Esq. Alice L. Fontier, Esq.
8		OFFICE OF JOSHUA L. DRATEL 2 Wall Street, Third Floor New York, NY 10005
9	(Mr. M. Mohamud)	Linda Moreno, Esq.
10	(222 0 220 220 220 220 220 220 220 220 2	LINDA MORENO, P.A. P.O. Box 10985
11		Tampa, FL 33679
12	(Mr. Doreh)	Ahmed Ghappour, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF AHMED GHAPPOUR
13		P.O. Box 20367 Seattle, WA 98102
14	(Mr. A. Mohamud)	Thomas A. Durkin, Esq.
15		DURKIN & ROBERTS 2446 N. Clark Street
16		Chicago, IL 60614
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
l	l e	

San Diego, California - Thursday, April 5, 2012 1 (Defendant Ahmed Nasir Taalil Mohamud is being assisted 2 3 by Somali interpreter Maryam Abdi.) 4 THE CLERK: Calling matter 1 on calendar, 5 10-CR-4246, USA versus Basaaly Saeed Moalin, Mohamed Mohamed 6 Mohamud, Issa Doreh, Ahmed Nasir Taalil Mohamud, set for 7 status hearing. 8 THE COURT: Counsel? MR. COLE: Good morning, your Honor. William Cole 9 and Caroline Han for the United States. 10 11 MR. DRATEL: Good morning, your Honor. Joshua Dratel and Alice Fontier for Basaaly Moalin, who is being led 12 13 to the jury box at this time. 14 MS. FONTIER: Good morning, your Honor. 15 MS. MORENO: Good morning, your Honor. Linda 16 Moreno on behalf of Mohamed Mohamud, who's in custody, 17 present in the courtroom. 18 MR. DURKIN: Tom Durkin on behalf of Ahmed Nasir 19 Taalil Mohamud, who is present and in custody. 20 MR. GHAPPOUR: Good morning, your Honor. Ahmed 21 Ghappour on behalf of Issa Doreh, who is present in custody. 22 THE COURT: All right. Thank you all. Let the 23 record -- that's fine, gentlemen, please be seated, and 24 welcome. Okay. This is set for status conference today, and 25

we have a few matters I think the defense wanted to discuss.

The government signed or submitted a statement of issues for today's hearing indicating they had no matters to be addressed at this point.

So looking at what's been submitted by counsel for defendant Moalin, the first item here is a reference to depositions pursuant to Rule 15, and there's a cryptic passage here that there are multiple witnesses in Somalia who are critical to the defense and cannot travel to the United States. If there are any issues related to depositions or discovery, I'm just going to defer all of those to the magistrate judge, Judge Gallo; and so after today's hearing, counsel can repair to Judge Gallo's chambers, and they can accommodate you by setting up a status conference or some kind of hearing date in the future where they can address any such -- any such concerns. Judge Gallo is not in today, he's out for approximately a week, out of the district, but his staff is ready, willing, and able to receive you today if you need to address deposition or other discovery issues.

The second matter indicates that the defendants wish to identify exculpatory material that counsel believe may be, well, exculpatory, which may be in the government's possession. That's fine. Counsel may certainly advise me in writing, as they've done already, and if there's any additional information that needs to be provided, they can do that. It is possible that in the future counsel and I may

sit down together in an ex parte setting, but that is unknown at this time.

Okay. Moving on, there are -- there's a third item here, that counsel -- wherein counsel are suggesting that they are available should the Court have any questions with respect to outstanding pretrial motions. Counsel, I appreciate your offer. At this time I do not have any questions concerning outstanding pretrial motions.

I will give you a little bit of a status update in terms of my progress here. I do have the FISA materials in my possession. They are voluminous -- let me put it that way -- they are something on the order of 2,000 pages or something approaching 2,000 pages. And so I am in the process of reviewing those materials. The CIPA materials have not yet been provided to me. I understand that they will be forthcoming. So that kind of gives you a bit of a head's up as to where I am in all of this.

So I have no further questions of counsel at this time, but, once again, I do appreciate your gracious offer as you've set it forth in the third item of your status report here.

The fourth is also a contingent suggestion. It reads, Also should the Court request an ex parte, in-camera meeting with defense counsel to discuss materials submitted by the government pursuant to Section 4 of CIPA and that

material's impact on the defense, defense counsel are available. Once again, I appreciate your offer. At this point -- I don't think at this point I could respond to it.

The fifth item here states that in addition, defendants wish to apprise the Court of an issue with respect to the interpreter who served as the Somali translator during the most recent court appearance in the case. I'm certainly happy to hear any concerns you may have there.

And then the sixth and last item indicates that defendants wish to inform the Court of ongoing difficulties in obtaining independent translations of the recorded conversations.

So that pretty much sums up where things are from my perspective right now, and it looks like items 5 and 6 may need some attention at this point. Before we get to those two items, anything from the government? Even though there was nothing set forth as a concern nor a request in the government's status report, Mr. Cole, anything to add?

MR. COLE: No, your Honor, we really -- we really don't have any issues for today other than responding to what the defense might have.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. If anyone would like to be heard with respect to the fifth item, please.

MR. DRATEL: Your Honor, may I just briefly be heard just on two other items just to give the Court some

more information?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. DRATEL: One is on Rule 15, it was our -- and we've talked to the government about this, and so we're trying to do this in as efficient manner as possible, and obviously we'll go to Magistrate Judge Gallo, but we wanted to sort of propose to the Court and to the government just -is that we will make a Rule 15 motion. We will identify the witnesses as we make a decision as to whether they are worth deposing or not, and so we'll try to do that on a rolling basis, but also that we were projecting that we should set aside -- when I say "we," I mean counsel -- just for logistical purposes and because of the nature of making these plans, perhaps August until -- you know, we alerted the government that we think August would be an opportune time to get these done, however many they are and to try to sort of get everybody's calendar in order. And like I say, it's not the Court obviously but counsel. And so we'll be making a motion and supplementing with just the individual names as we add to it.

And also with respect to exculpatory material, we did receive some additional discovery from the government late or -- either early this week or late last week, and that I think includes some of it and perhaps all the material that we earmarked, so we don't have anything to say today about

1 | that.

2.2

The only other thing on FISA, your Honor, is that 2,000 pages; that's I think unfortunate. I think it's sort of unfair to put that all on the Court. We're happy to assist in regard to that. I think that's counsel's role, to wade through that kind of material rather than make the Court and staff do it. So that's where we are on that.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you. Anyone else have anything to add? Apparently not. Okay.

MR. DURKIN: Judge, did you want to discuss the interpreter?

THE COURT: Well, yes. I think items 5 and 6 I think are open to discussion at this point --

MR. DURKIN: The issue with --

THE COURT: -- if there are no other issues that want -- that counsel needed to address before those two items dealing with the interpreter and with any difficulty concerning independent translations.

MR. DURKIN: The only thing I would add to what Mr. Dratel said, unless I missed it --

THE COURT: Why don't you use the lectern and the microphone there.

MR. DURKIN: The only thing I would add is we did discuss with the government that we would attempt to take those depositions in August; is that correct? We've notified

the government that we would attempt to have those 1 2 depositions taken in August. 3 MR. DRATEL: Yes, that's right. 4 MR. DURKIN: Maybe I missed that. 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MR. DURKIN: Judge, the interpreter issue is my 7 client's issue. My client is the only defendant who uses the 8 court interpreter, but he also does speak some English, and 9 he apprised me after the last hearing that he thought that 10 there were simply misinterpretation going on, and I don't 11 know how we resolve that because -- I'm sure how to --12 THE COURT: How would he know? 13 MR. DURKIN: Well, that's what I'm saying. 14 knows a little bit of English --15 THE COURT: Well, I assume the other -- his 16 co-defendants know quite a bit of Somali, and your -- so they 17 may have a better ability, an enhanced ability, more so than 18 your client to understand what's being translated here, or 19 interpreted. And if your client is the only one who's 20 expressing any concern, it may be that his limited English is 21 perhaps getting in the way of his analysis here. 22 MS. MORENO: May I be heard on that issue, your 23 Honor? 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MS. MORENO: I've also been apprised by my client,

2.2

who does speak Somali and does speak English, although he does not have the earphones that Mr. Durkin has, that when he hears -- from his vantage point, he's been at different times closer to the translator and further away -- that there have been significant mistranslations and mistakes that she has made in translation. So I can offer that for the Court's consideration.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, it's my understanding that we've been using certified Somali interpreters; am I correct in that assumption? Anyone wish to chime in?

MR. COLE: Well, your Honor, I don't know. I know the chief interpreter from -- for your -- from this Court is the one who's been retaining the interpreter. I assume that she's been retaining interpreters she feels are appropriate. I of course don't have any ability to tell you if this is good interpretation or not.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GHAPPOUR: Your Honor, if I may, my understanding based on my conversations both with Ms. Moreno and Mr. Durkin as well as my client is it's -- and it may logically make more sense -- is that the Somali itself that's being spoken doesn't sound correct. So irrespective of whether or not the translation is correct, the Somali itself isn't even what was described to me as it's not even Somali a second language or even Somali as a third language; the

quality of the language being spoken in Somali is that low.

So irrespective of whether or not we can make a logical, you know, connection between the translation, it's the quality of the language itself that's not sufficient.

THE COURT: Okay. I'll look into this then and be able to provide further information for you. How many different -- I don't know -- I have not been keeping track myself actually; I've just been assuming that each of the Somali interpreters have been certified. Nothing has been brought to my attention before today concerning any difficulties. In any event, three of the four defendants, that is, with the exception of Ahmed Mohamud, are not requiring the services of a Somali interpreter; they're all conversant in English, and as I say, this issue has not been brought to my attention previously.

Are there any particular dialects or regional variations of Somali that counsel may be aware of that might be helpful to me as I look into this matter a bit?

Mr. Durkin, have you had an opportunity to address that or look into that?

MR. DURKIN: I have not. Could I just speak briefly with my client? There may be a simple answer.

THE COURT: Well, I don't want -- I don't want the clients -- I don't want the defendants to be driving the --

25 MR. DURKIN: No, I understand.

```
THE COURT: -- the analysis here. I'm advised by
 1
 2
     the court clerk that -- that is, the courtroom deputy -- that
 3
     we've had two different interpreters here, and they're --
 4
               MR. DURKIN: I believe that's correct, and that --
 5
               THE COURT: -- each are -- each are certified --
 6
               MR. DURKIN: I there was a male --
 7
               THE COURT: -- and that our interpreters office --
 8
               MR. DURKIN: -- interpreter before. The only thing
 9
     I do know, Judge, is that my client is from the north, and I
10
     know there's a difference between people that come -- in
11
     dialect in people that come from the north versus the south,
12
     and that --
13
               THE COURT: Are there separate dialects to your
14
    knowledge?
15
               MR. DURKIN: I hesitate to call them dialects, but
16
17
               THE COURT: Are there variations in --
18
               MR. DURKIN: I think there is. I think they're a
     different dialect.
19
20
               THE COURT: But your client hasn't -- you haven't
21
    had that conversation with your client yet? In other words,
22
    he's not telling you he's from the north and he suspects that
23
     the -- what he's hearing is perhaps a variation from the
24
     south and therefore there might be a little bit of
25
     difficulty --
```

```
MR. DURKIN: He did not --
 1
 2
               THE COURT: -- or he hasn't given you any other
 3
     explanation as to --
 4
               MR. DURKIN: I didn't get into that kind of detail
 5
    with him, Judge.
 6
               THE COURT:
                          Well, okay. Well, you can --
 7
               MR. DURKIN: I can try to do that.
               THE COURT: -- you can do that when we're not
 8
 9
     taking up time with other matters.
10
               MR. DURKIN: Yes, sir.
11
               THE COURT: But I'll look into that. And if we
12
    have certified interpreters, then there's not too much more
13
     the Court can do other than look into the issue with the
14
    interpreters, with our chief interpreter here, and see if
15
     there's any way we can enhance the -- the interpreting
16
     process for your particular client --
17
               MR. DURKIN: That's fine.
18
               THE COURT: -- Mr. Durkin.
19
               MR. DURKIN: And I'll try to get more specific
20
     information.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. All right. That will help.
2.2
    Anything that you can provide to us by way of whether there
23
     are additional dialects or whether the language may vary from
24
    region to region would be helpful in that regard. Okay. So
25
     that's the issue with the interpreter; it relates just to
```

Mr. Durkin's client, and I'll look into that. Okay. Then we have some issue or concern regarding independent translations of recorded conversations. Who would like to speak to that?

MS. MORENO: Yes, your Honor. And it touches --

THE COURT: Ms. Moreno, please.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. MORENO: Thank you, your Honor, if I may. it touches upon what -- some of the discussion that the Court has just had. It has been an arduous effort to get translators who, one, are certified; and, two, who have no conflict, meaning that the -- probably every translator/interpreter that I've contacted has worked for the military, the State Department, the Department of Justice, and many apparently are knowledgeable about this case, have had contacts with witnesses around the country, and so we can't -- we can't use them. I'm only apprising the Court that we are -- we are trying to resolve this situation, but we thought it was important to apprise the Court of the efforts that we're making in this regard given the fact that we have 1800 phone calls. We're not talking about translating all 1800 phone calls, but what we are talking about is certainly not only the universe of calls that the government has indicated it's going to use at the trial; I would say the overwhelming majority of those phone calls are all extremely edited, one minute out of a ten-minute phone call, so of course we would looking at the entire phone call.

```
This takes a lot of effort and time, and it's --
 1
 2
               THE COURT:
                          When you say they've been edited, you
 3
    mean the translations that you've received the government has
 4
    been good enough to provide are heavily edited; is that what
 5
     you're saying?
 6
               MS. MORENO: Edited in the -- in the sense that
 7
    some of the translations are lifted from the middle of a
     conversation, some of the translated transcripts are -- begin
 8
    in the middle of a sentence and end in another sentence.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Understood. So you need to have the
11
     entire conversation --
12
               MS. MORENO: Exactly, your Honor. So we just
    wanted to apprise the Court of the ongoing efforts that the
13
14
     defense is making in this regard and the difficulties that
15
    we're encountering.
16
               THE COURT: How much headway have you made thus
17
     far?
18
               MS. MORENO: Yes, we did actually -- sorry -- we
19
    had a gentleman who -- actually he's I think familiar to this
20
     Court -- got some of our work and became ill and had to drop
21
     out and so we had to start the process all over again.
22
    Apparently he's --
23
               THE COURT: You mean the process of trying to
24
     obtain someone?
25
               MS. MORENO: Yes. And so I currently have a
```

```
handful of resumes, all of whom indicate on the resumes that
 1
 2
     these translators have worked for the State Department and
 3
     the Department of Justice, and so in my interviews, I'm
 4
     trying to vet them and send them at least information to see
 5
     if they have in any way touched this case.
 6
               THE COURT: Okay. And in terms of what's been
 7
    provided to you, the conversations that have been provided to
 8
     you and identified as pertinent by the government -- I think
 9
     there are a couple of hundred that fall into that category,
10
     and then you have obviously many hundred additional
11
     conversations that have been provided to you -- can you
     quantify how far into that process you've gotten, 10 percent,
12
13
     40 percent, 80 percent? I mean is that --
14
               MS. MORENO: It's very, very difficult, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: All right. That's fine.
16
               MS. MORENO: I'm very sorry.
               THE COURT: Is there a division of labor that's
17
18
    been set up so that you're kind of sharing --
19
               MS. MORENO: We are.
20
               THE COURT: -- the burden.
21
               MS. MORENO: We are a real team in that respect,
```

MS. MORENO: We are a real team in that respect, and certainly all of our clients have been working assiduously in that regard in helping us. But at the end of the day, we have to find the certified translators/interpreters we will be able to use with respect

2.2

23

24

to these telephone calls in the context of a trial that could be potential witnesses.

THE COURT: I know there have been many cases involving defendants with Somalia as their country of origin brought and then even tried throughout the country, and I would imagine there have been translators, and perhaps many translators, who have provided assistance to defense counsel in connection with many of these matters. I assume, given the national scope of the collective practices of all of you, you have access to these individuals, their names and contact information. Are you saying that you've really delved deeply into that list and almost exhausted it without coming up with people?

MS. MORENO: Your Honor, I'm not saying that I've exhausted it; I would be before the Court to say that, but I'm not saying that. We are just giving you a status report. In fact, I have reached out to two of the translators who worked on the Minnesota cases for the defense and now they're working with the Department of Justice and have exclusive contracts and won't work with the defense. So there are a variety and host of special problems with respect to these cases. Even though one could say that there are a lot of cases involving Somalis in the country, really the pool of certified Somali translators is excruciatingly small, your Honor, and that is what we're having to deal with, but we --

We continue on.

2.2

THE COURT: I think the issue of a conflict is a two-way street. I'm just trying to think out loud here a little bit. Maybe I'm off base here, but once you have a -- have a translator working for the defense community in one or more of these cases, it presents perhaps a conflict for the government to engage that individual. Mr. Cole, do you have any such limitations?

MR. COLE: Well, the only thing I would add -- I can't add a lot to this discussion other than to mention that we have only used to my knowledge -- only linguists that we have used in our case are FBI employees or contractors, people who literally work for the FBI, and we have used this local linguist a few times to do some work for us --

THE COURT: You say FBI or contractors.

MR. COLE: When I say --

THE COURT: The contractor realm can be very large.

MR. COLE: I don't even know why I said
"contractors" other than that. I guess I just suddenly
realized I don't know what all their employment relationship
is exactly with the FBI, but my understanding is that they
are FBI linguists, captive FBI linguists. We've only gone to
the FBI for their linguists that are on their staff to
translate this case. We haven't gone to the State
Department, we haven't gone to the military.

Now, it may be -- I mean I appreciate the defense vetting to make sure they don't run into some -- some buzz saw with some conflict issue because it could be that someone in the State Department or military knows about this case, but we have not gone to those sources for translations in this case; we've gone only to the FBI's language specialists, and we haven't hired outside people or contracted outside people. Other than that, we did use this interpreter earlier on before she became a court interpreter, to do some work -not any translations we're relying on in court, not anything -- we're not relying on anything that this interpreter did for presentation in court, but she help us with some matters early on in our case, our investigation for prosecution. So I just want to let the Court and the defense know that. I don't doubt it is difficult to find interpreters, but we have not gone out and gobbled up people outside --THE COURT: We're just talking about translators at this point, not necessarily interpreters. MR. COLE: I'm sorry. THE COURT: There's a difference. MR. COLE: Translators, translators, yes. haven't gone out and gobbled up any translators other than

25 THE COURT: Okay.

those who work for the FBI.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MS. MORENO: Okay. That's helpful. 1 2 THE COURT: So I think I'm hearing the government's 3 not out on a -- some kind of a, you know, a goal here or 4 program to co-opt all translators throughout the entire 5 country. 6 MS. MORENO: You mean I don't get to use that 7 argument anymore, your Honor? 8 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 9 MS. MORENO: I don't get to use that argument 10 anymore? 11 THE COURT: Well, no, I can appreciate that you may 12 have some difficulties locating people, but I'm assuming that 13 those translators with whom defense counsel have worked in 14 other cases would I think perhaps by government protocol or 15 policy be disqualified thereafter from translating for the 16 government because of the same types of conflict principles. 17 I thought I heard that earlier on in the case that once an 18 independent expert or translator works with the defense in a 19 similar case, that they're not brought on by the government. 20 MR. COLE: I think, your Honor, that might be true 21 if the person worked on this case, but I don't think the fact 22 that somebody's worked for the defense -- defense bar would 23 mean they can't work for the government or vice versa. 24 THE COURT: All right.

MR. COLE: And we -- I think the big problem comes

into the areas, as counsel mentioned, that we did not translate -- because we also have only limited resources.

Even though we had access to the FBI linguists, there aren't as many of those as we'd like, and so that's why we didn't translate entire phone calls where they're chatting about this, that, or the other. And so I understand why they would want to know what those portions of the calls say.

As to the portions we have translated, we are more than happy to sit down with the defense counsel, and if they think there are things that need to be corrected in those, even if they haven't used a certified translator, if they have somebody who they want -- if they want our translator to take a second look at a sentence based on something their client tells them about the sentence, for example, we're happy to try to work out issues with our translations if there are any and to stipulate to changes if it's appropriate.

THE COURT: Think it was the vice versa reference in your -- at the beginning of your statement here that intrigued me a little bit. So you were suggesting that if there were a translator, for example, who had worked on behalf of the defense in another case, that would not be a disqualifying feature for the government, so my -- one suggestion I have is if you're aware of translators who the government has deemed competent and helpful in past cases

with the government but not on this case, you may be able to provide a list, a short list, of those individuals so that the defense community here can have ready access to them.

Obviously, they haven't worked on this case, and I would assume that the reciprocity that you suggested in your earlier statement would be something that defense counsel would be happy to embrace; is that correct, Ms. Moreno?

MS. MORENO: Absolutely, your Honor. And it also would be helpful if we could be provided a list of the names of the translators that worked on the translations of these transcripts. If you could give us those names, that would be very helpful in terms of our continuing endeavor.

THE COURT: All right. Well, I tell you what -- go ahead.

MR. COLE: All I was going to say is I'd be happy to -- I can go back to our counterterrorism section in Washington, DC and ask for their collective experience around the country. Be happy to provide anything we can come up with in terms of cases they've seen where the other side has found a translator. I'll get those names to the defense. I'm not as sanguine about providing them with the names of our FBI language specialists. There's reasons for that that I could address with the Court separately, but --

THE COURT: Anything you can do could be helpful to move the process along.

MR. COLE: Right.

2.2

THE COURT: We're dealing with a lot of material in this case. Obviously the parties have a lot of material they need to -- they need to review and master, the Court as well. So I think that's a positive development here, and any issues -- seeing as how you're going to -- we're going to bring Judge Gallo into the picture here as a result of the reference to Rule 15 and depositions perhaps being taken, and perhaps Judge Gallo, to the extent he may be available in the future, can deal with these types of issues as well; they do more or less relate indirectly to discovery.

Before we leave these two areas we've been discussing here, the interpreter for Mr. Durkin's client and translators, may I have the name of the interpreter who's assisting -- who's assisting us today? I think she was on our last -- at our last hearing as well. Would you please state your name and spell your name for us.

THE INTERPRETER: Yes, Maryam, last name A-b-d-i.

THE COURT: I'm sorry. If you could speak louder.

THE INTERPRETER: Maryam, last name A-b-d-i.

THE COURT: Okay. And it's my understanding you are certified; is that correct?

THE INTERPRETER: Registered.

THE COURT: Registered? All right. What is the difference, as far as you're concerned, being certified and

registered?

2.2

THE INTERPRETER: Well, with the courts, the registration means that you go through the English portion of the exam. I do work also as a -- as a contractor with several governmental agencies. With that you are required to also take the examination in Somali and in English, so with other agencies I did have to go through the process. But with the court system here in San Diego, only the English portion is available as of this year.

THE COURT: Okay. That's helpful. Thank you. And the head of our interpreters here, our court interpreters office, has all of your contact information obviously; is that correct?

THE INTERPRETER: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Thank you. Thank you for your assistance; we do appreciate it.

THE INTERPRETER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel, anything further?

MR. DRATEL: Yes, your Honor, if I may. Something that just came up this morning, which is the dramatic difference in getting to the courtroom today, which is of significant concern to us on the defense, which is the -- I know that security is obviously a sensitive issue, but it's at a level outside the courtroom that I think is unwarranted given the fact that we've been here so many times before.

And just looking forward to what it's going to mean to a jury 1 2 I think is overwhelming in that regard and just 3 extraordinarily prejudicial to the defendants before we even 4 start the case in a way that we'll never be able to overcome. 5 THE COURT: Well, I really don't have any -- do you 6 care to be --7 MR. DRATEL: Oh, yeah. There's a magnetometer outside the courtroom. 8 9 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 10 MR. DRATEL: There's a magnetometer outside the 11 courtroom for spectators to come in, and I just -- it hasn't been there before. I think downstairs the line was 12 13 significantly longer, and the process of getting through even 14 the magnetometer downstairs was materially different than it 15 was before, and, you know, it's just -- it's just a signal to 16 a jury that this is a different kind of case with different 17 kind of defendants, and it's just --18 THE COURT: Well, I think we're getting way ahead 19 of ourselves at this point. I can allay your concern --20 well, perhaps not -- but at least I can address the comment 21 you've made by indicating we've had magnetometers outside our 22 courtrooms in many cases in the past; I've had them in 23 several cases I've had in the past having nothing to do with

And I will -- I take your concern to heart, and I'll look

national security issues, but other security issues as well.

24

into that and I'll see why there's been some kind of a change, if there has been. I have no reason to doubt what you're telling me.

MR. DRATEL: And, your Honor, also just two things. One is that, you know, there's not even -- I don't know of the types of cases that magnetometers been outside the court before, but here we haven't had any allegations of violence by the defendants, any allegations of anything in the United States, any of that.

Also, there was one other difference, which is -and I'm not suggesting that -- again, this is, you know, a
security issue in terms of -- it's more about the appearances
of it and when it's done -- is that there was a dog that they
had to go through the courtroom before I guess the marshals,
which I'm just very sensitive to that being done in a way
that any you know, ultimately when we're down the road that
any juror could see, you know. That's just a whole other
level of alert for a jury that's unnecessary in this case and
prejudicial. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Any other issues that need to be addressed before we adjourn?

MR. DRATEL: Yes.

THE COURT: Mr. Dratel?

MR. DRATEL: Sorry. Your Honor, we talked among us on the defense side about perhaps coming back in the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

beginning of July, at which point we might want to set in-limine schedules and some of the other things that were not recalibrated when we changed the trial date.

THE COURT: I think if it -- I think if all we're looking at is the setting of dates for in limines and perhaps other status conferences, I'm going to let that go and probably set that in an order. There will be an order forthcoming obviously once I complete the review of FISA, assuming that there's no need to bring counsel into the mix under 1806 (f). I haven't prejudged that issue at all, and I've been through the papers on that, that is, your papers on that. But in my view, this status conference would have been better put off, trailed for a period of time. I had my staff contact defense counsel, as you know, with the suggestion that we do that, especially in light where I am vis-a-vis the review of materials here. But counsel did want to come in, and so I certainly did not want to discourage them from coming in, but in my view, this is a hearing that could have been put off.

So having a status conference just for the sake of having a status conference I'm not too concerned about.

Because Judge Gallo is going to become involved with discovery -- and I am requesting that counsel see Judge Gallo's staff after we're done here -- I don't know that we need to get involved with discovery issues in the immediate

future. I think it's better if, as I'm going through materials and we're getting a little farther into the case, that I set a status conference, if necessary, in an order, and then certainly I'll be able to address the setting of a date for motions in limine and also a briefing schedule for motions in limine as well, keeping in mind, obviously, the October date and making every effort to maintain that as a firm date here. Okay?

MR. DRATEL: All right. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Anything further from defense counsel?

MS. MORENO: I'm sorry, your Honor. And would the briefing schedule also include a questionnaire, voir dire protocols, et cetera? Would that be --

THE COURT: You know, if appropriate. I don't know that those are the kinds of things that we need to address in a substantive order just by way of setting up a date or further dates or the remaining dates in the case before we proceed to trial. I think at some point a further status conference will be helpful, but I don't know that I'm ready to set it right now, and I think that -- I think that at that status conference we can address issues such as a questionnaire, if we're going to use one and, if so, what areas should be delved into; I assume that I'd be open to each side submitting an exemplar of a questionnaire that they

would wish to have utilized in the case, as well as other preliminaries.

2.2

So what I'm trying to get away from is just automatically setting status conferences where not an awful lot of business is being conducted, okay? It may well be that we have another one within a few months. Let's just see how things shake out. Okay. Anything from the government before we adjourn? Mr. Cole?

MR. COLE: No, your Honor. Will the court's staff, before a further order comes out, just check us with dates because summer's coming, and I just want to make sure we don't inadvertently get dates that we're all going to be out of the district or something.

THE COURT: Well, you know, what might be helpful is if counsel -- I was going to say if counsel advise us as to any dates that they're not going to be available. I mean if counsel are aware of other dates where they're, for example, going to be taking a bit of time to themselves or they're involved in trial work, other trials have been set that certainly look like they're going to proceed, that would be helpful in terms of setting any further dates here. I just don't want to bring you all back in. I know, you know, that there are time and expense factors, and to bring you back just to set dates I think would be a bit counterproductive; I just don't want to impose that burden

particularly on the defense community. So if you can perhaps confer amongst yourselves as to your availability, for example, for a date for motions in limine, it might be helpful to get all motions in limine resolved no later than two weeks before your trial date. If you want to set the date for motions in limine within a two- to four-week window before your trial date, that's probably the better time to do it. Come up with a suggested date or two for motions in limine.

Typically when it comes to motions in limine, I like to have at least a couple of weeks -- in a case like this -- a couple of weeks to go over all the material myself, so I'm looking at the completion of all briefing at least two weeks before the date set for motions in limine. And then you have three rounds of briefing; you have your motions that are filed three weeks before that cutoff date, you have opposition filed two weeks before that cutoff date, you have any reply one week before the cutoff date, so you can even work together on coming up with a schedule that you feel would work for all of you. If not, I mean I'll be happy to set a schedule a bit farther down the road.

Those are the things we're looking -- we're looking at from this point forward. Obviously -- I know defense counsel have suggested in their papers that it might be appropriate to sit down with the Court. I haven't made that

determination at this point as to whether that would be necessary. I'm still, as you know, at the beginning stages of reviewing material here, so -- that's FISA material, not even CIPA material, so that's pretty much where we are at this point. Anything further from the defense or the government then before we draw this to a close? Apparently not.

Mr. Durkin, I will look into the issue of Somali interpreters, and I'll think about how to address that with you, whether that should be by letter or order or in some other fashion.

MR. DURKIN: As will I.

THE COURT: If you have an opportunity to talk to your -- talk to your client, that might be helpful as well.

MR. DURKIN: I'm assuming they're going to be downstairs for a little while this morning.

THE COURT: Hopefully. I would ask if Mr. Durkin can be accommodated by meeting his client for a brief period of time to get this -- get a little bit more information, that would be helpful to the Court. So let's proceed in that fashion.

MR. DURKIN: Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. All right.

Thank you. Then we'll adjourn for today. Your pending -- I

don't have a -- I don't have a further date to set for you at

```
this point, but obviously we have many motions pending and
 1
 2
     the case is designated as complex in any event, but we have
    pending motions, and the Speedy Trial clock continues to be
 3
 4
     tolled.
 5
               MR. DURKIN: No objection, your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel.
          (The proceedings were concluded.)
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

Certificate of Reporter

I hereby certify that I am a duly appointed, qualified, and acting Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court; that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the mentioned cause on the date or dates listed on the title page of the transcript; and that the format used herein complies with the rules and requirements of the United States Judicial Conference.

Dated May 25, 2012 at San Diego, California.

/s/ Debra M. Henson (electronic)
Debra M. Henson
Official Court Reporter